

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/623,640

Applicant(s)

GUO ET AL.

Examiner

Emily Bernhardt

Art Unit

1624

All Participants:(1) Emily Bernhardt.(2) Mr. Hansen.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 January 2005**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1,4 and 12

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

E Bernhardt

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of claims discussed:

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The case would be in condition for allowance if nonelected subject matter is removed. It was pointed out to Mr. Hansen that in claims 1,4 and 12 "n" needs to be limited to 1 and $V=CH$ and $W=CR_2$ consistent with the restriction requirement. Thus all nonelected and superfluous subject matter can be deleted by an Examiner's Amendment. Mr. Hansen approved of the deletions. It was also pointed out that punctuation marks (i.e. periods) are missing in the Abstract which will also be corrected by the examiner..